

Application No. 10/750,522
Response to Office action of November 8, 2007

Atty. Docket No. 042390.P16465
TC/A.U. 2823

Remarks

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 16-30 have been withdrawn. Claims 1 and 31 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 2, 3, 12, 14, 15, 32, and 35 have been amended. Thus, claims 2-15 and 32-36 remain pending in the application.

Claim Objections

Claims 32-36 were objected to because of an informality associated with the preambles of each claim. In response, the Applicant has amended the preamble of each claim to correct the informality. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claims 32-36 be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-11 and 32-34 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 2-11 depend (directly or indirectly) from claim 1 and claims 32-36 depend (directly or indirectly) from claim 31.

Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 3, 12, 14, and 15 have been amended to depend from amended claim 2. Original claims 4-11 and 13 depend (either directly or indirectly) from claim 2. Thus, claim 2 is allowable and claims 3-11 depend from an allowable claim.

Application No. 10/750,522
Response to Office action of November 8, 2007

Atty. Docket No. 042390.P16465
TC/A.U. 2823

Claim 32 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 35 has been amended to depend from amended claim 32. Original claims 33, 34, and 36 depend (either directly or indirectly) from claim 32. Thus, claim 32 is allowable and claims 33-36 depend (either directly or indirectly) from an allowable claim.

Claim Rejections § 102

Claims 1, 12, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,954,473 issued to Dehmubed et al. (*Dehmubed*). Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice and, thus, the rejection of claim 1 is moot. For at least the reasons set forth below, the Applicant submits that claims 12 and 13 are not anticipated by *Dehmubed*.

Claims 12 and 13 have been amended to depend (directly or indirectly) from allowable claim 2. For at least the reason that dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 12 and 13 are not anticipated by *Dehmubed*.

Claim Rejections § 103

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,949,761 issued to Chu et al. (*Chu*). For at least the reasons set forth below, the Applicant submits that claim 14 is patentable over *Chu*.

Application No. 10/750,522
Response to Office action of November 8, 2007

Atty. Docket No. 042390.P16465
TC/A.U. 2823

Claim 14 has been amended to depend (directly or indirectly) from allowable claim 2. For at least the reason that dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 14 is patentable over *Chu*.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dehmubed* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,424,450 issued to Goossen (*Goossen*). For at least the reasons set forth below, the Applicant submits that claim 15 is patentable over *Dehmubed* in view *Goossen*.

Claim 15 has been amended to depend (directly or indirectly) from allowable claim 2. For at least the reason that dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is patentable over *Dehmubed* in view *Goossen*.

Claims 31, 35, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dehmubed* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,403,975 issued to Brunner et al. (*Brunner*). Claim 31 has been cancelled without prejudice and, thus, the rejection of claim 31 is moot. For at least the reasons set forth below, the Applicant submits that claims 35 and 36 are patentable over *Brunner*.

Claims 35 and 36 have been amended to depend (directly or indirectly) from allowable claim 32. For at least the reason that dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 35 and 36 are patentable over *Dehmubed* in view *Brunner*.

Application No. 10/750,522
Response to Office action of November 8, 2007

Atty. Docket No. 042390.P16465
TC/A.U. 2823

Conclusion

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 2, 2007

/Philip A. Pedigo/
Philip A. Pedigo
Reg. No. 52,107
Attorney for Intel Corporation

Intel Corporation
2200 Mission College Blvd.
Santa Clara, CA 95052
(503) 712-5560